

money comes out of the Aviation Trust Fund, which is entirely supported by passenger ticket taxes and general aviation fuel taxes.

The money was assumed in last year's omnibus appropriations bill, so spending it now will not add a dime to the Federal deficit. More than 150 airports in every state in the Nation will benefit from these grants. It is essential that we move quickly on this bill.

The fiscal year ends on Thursday, and this bill must be signed into law before then in order for these necessary funds to be released. The Senate passed this bill on Friday, so favorable action by the House now would clear the measure for the President. I would expect the President to sign this bill. The FAA could then begin issuing the grants immediately. Given the late date, it should do this without the usual 3 day prior notification.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to fully support this bill so that airport grant money will not be wasted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of passage of S. 1637. This bill provides for extension of the Airport Improvement Program through the end of fiscal year 1999 and allows the Federal Aviation Administration to release the remaining AIP funds for this fiscal year to fund critical airport development projects. Each state will get additional aviation resources by the action the House will take today.

The best solution for the Nation's airports and air traffic control system is a long-term reauthorization bill that will unlock the trust funds, as we have done in legislation that has already passed the House. We are acting today in a responsible manner to assure that airports do not lose available funding.

This past June 15 the House passed H.R. 1000, the Aviation and Investment Reform Act, AIR 21, by an overwhelming vote of 316 to 110. This critically important legislation is needed to move the aviation system into the 21st Century by providing adequate long-term funding for the FAA and for the Airport Improvement Program.

Unfortunately, the other body has not been able to pass a comprehensive FAA reauthorization bill. The House approach is preferable, but with the AIP program lapsed as of August 6, a short-term extension is better than losing scarce and precious airport development dollars. But this extension should not be misread by anyone. We will continue to insist on a long-term reauthorization bill for fiscal years 2000 to 2004.

The Nation's aviation system increasingly is in gridlock. Passenger frustration is growing and airport capital needs are underfunded by at least \$3 billion a year. We have to ensure

long-term funding and a management reform plan for the FAA to address these problems, as we have already done in legislation crafted by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

It is appalling that we have reached a situation of gridlock when there are aviation revenues unused in the Aviation Trust Fund, specifically, as the chairman already cited, \$290 million for AIP. I understand the concerns that have been expressed that the FAA may be unable to issue grants by the end of the fiscal year. The reason for that is language in the manager's statement in the conference report for an emergency supplemental appropriations bill passed in the spring of 1998.

In that report, the managers directed the Department of Transportation to notify the Committee on Appropriations not less than 3 business days before any AIP grant is announced by the department. If that requirement is imposed on the pending bill, it may not be possible to make all grants authorized by this legislation before the end of the fiscal year, after which, of course, the funds will no longer be available.

As a matter of law, we do not believe that the discussion in the conference report on the fiscal year 1998 supplemental emergency supplemental appropriations bill imposes any requirement with respect to funds authorized for fiscal year 2000 by the pending bill. The Committee on Appropriations does not have jurisdiction to impose permanent conditions applying to funds made available in the future. Had the Committee on Appropriations attempted to impose a permanent requirement of prior notice through legislative language, that language would have been subject to a point of order under rule XXI, clause 2, of the rules of the House.

To resolve any questions about this matter, I state affirmatively that it is the intention of the pending bill that grants be made as promptly as possible and that the announcement of grants not be delayed for the purpose of giving prior notice to any Congressional committee.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and with the other body to get agreement on a long term reauthorization bill.

I also want to express my strong concern over aviation provisions in the DOT appropriations bill passed by the other body. If these provisions are included in the bill reported from conference, I will have difficulty supporting that bill.

My greatest concern is that the bill passed by the other body includes legislative earmarks for airport development projects.

This is a dangerous precedent. We have never done so in House authoriza-

tion bills in aviation. We have objected to any such language in appropriations bills. Until now our airport development funds have been allocated by safety professionals in the Department of Transportation. These officials are in the best position to make objective decisions as to where limited Federal funds should be invested for the maximum benefit, for the safety and efficiency of our airport and air traffic control system.

Our aviation system is a complex national interrelated system. Its development must be managed by officials who have the big picture in mind and who understand these interrelationships.

Although the bill passed by the other body has only a few legislative earmarks, some might argue, I would state that it is a dangerous precedent which should be ended now. Our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and I have both expressed these concerns in a letter to the appropriations conferees, and I take this opportunity to reaffirm that letter and to stand firm against this very bad and very dangerous precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, because of the necessity for fast action on this, request that the clerks expedite their processing of the papers in regard to this legislation, and I urge support of all of my colleagues for this very worthwhile and important legislation in regard to our Nation's airports.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1637.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1637 and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.